



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/176,171 10/21/98 CHENG

D PHA23.503

EXAMINER

WM01/1010

CORPORATE PATENT COUNSEL
U S PHILIPS CORPORATION
580 WHITE PLAINS ROAD
TARRYTOWN NY 10591

PHAM, T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2632

DATE MAILED:

10/10/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/176,171

Applicant(s)
Cheng

Examiner
Toan Pham

Art Unit
2632



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 3, 2001
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2632

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 17-20, 25-31 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bassett et al. (5,706,191) in view of Rietkerk (5,748,083) (of record).

Regarding claim 17: Bassett et al. discloses a system for the appliances (25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, 55, 60, 65) are plugged into a distributed network (20) which a plurality of these appliances communicates to effect a control of the appliances (Fig. 1), a first appliances ²⁵ (70) of the plurality of appliances having a first appliance component that is configured to effect a primary function of the first appliance that is independent of security (see Figs. 1, 15). Bassett et al. also discloses an appliance interface module (AIM) ⁽⁷⁰⁾ for providing a monitoring and diagnostic functions of the appliance (col. 6, lines 5-14); and connecting alarms and security systems into the overall automation for communicating to effect a control of the appliances (col. 14, lines 53-63). Thus, it is inherent that the AIM is a status reporter which provides the monitoring and diagnostic to the system controller (15). Bassett et al. does not specifically disclose the security system comprising a status reporter for reporting an alarm status. Rietkerk discloses a security system comprising a

Art Unit: 2632

status reporter (117) for communicating a status of the first appliance (107) via the network (4); an alarm activation processor (112, 113), operably coupled to the status reporter (117), for receiving the status and effecting an alarm response dependent on the status (col. 4, lines 23-29; col. 5, lines 42-53, 64-67; col. 6, lines 1-2; Figs. 1A, 1B and 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilized a status reporter as taught by Rietkerk in a system as disclosed by Bassett et al. for providing the status of the appliance within the network and for providing operation information as well as security information.

Regarding claim 18: Rietkerk discloses the second appliance (107) with a second appliance component for effecting a second primary function independent of security; and the alarm activation processor is integrated in the second appliance (see Figs. 1A, 1B and 2).

Regarding claims 19 and 20: Bassett et al. does not disclose a respective HAVi and Home API-compliant module; however, Bassett et al. discloses an interactive appliance interface and management system that are plugged into a distributed network (20) which a plurality of these appliances communicates to effect a control of the appliances (abstract; Fig. 1) which are home appliances that are programmed and interfaced to work with one another to provide a security monitoring and diagnostic system. Thus, these devices are programmed to work in compliance with one another. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a security system for the home or office in protecting the appliances with programming capability.

Art Unit: 2632

Regarding claim 25: Rietkerk discloses the appliance being an asset (107) to be protected includes a desktop computer, a notebook computer, a laptop computer, a printer, a keyboard, a computer monitor, etc. (col. 4, lines 44-54; Fig. 2); thus, Rietkerk discloses a plurality of appliances having an alarm activation processor (141), operably coupled to the status reporter (117), for receiving the status and effecting the alarm response dependent on the status and dependent upon the rule base associated with the appliance (col. 4, lines 23-29; col. 5, lines 42-53, 64-67; col. 6, lines 1-2; Figs. 1A, 1B, 2, 3 and 4). Thus, the rule base is to identify whether the event is an alarm detection condition (e.g. motion or circuit disruption) or a tamper condition (e.g. APD removal/intrusion, or cord damage) and to notify security personnel to the location of the alarm and/or tamper condition (col. 5, lines 42-53, 64-67; col. 6, lines 1-2).

Regarding claim 26: See claim 17 above.

Regarding claims 27 and 28: See claims 19 and 20 above.

Regarding claim 29: See claim 17 above.

Regarding claims 30 and 31: See claims 19 and 20 above.

Regarding claim 33: See claim 25 above.

3. Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bassett et al. (5,706,191) in view of Rietkerk (5,748,083) (of record) as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Hall et al. (5,898,831) (of record).

Art Unit: 2632

Regarding claim 21: Rietkerk discloses the appliance security system in which a plurality of appliances interacts with one another responsive to the security conditions (col. 14, lines 37-54; col. 15, lines 23-35); thus, the process is inherent of the third appliance (C) having a second alarm activation processor from the second appliance (B), and is inherently operably coupled to the status reporter via the network in which these appliances communicate, for receiving the status and effecting a second alarm response dependent on the status. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the linking of the alarm activation processor as taught by Hall et al. in a system as disclosed by Bassett et al. in view of Rietkerk for providing an alarm notification for the appliances within a network.

Regarding claim 22: Hall et al. discloses the second alarm response is dependent upon a status of the second appliance (col. 14, lines 37-54).

Regarding claim 23: Rietkerk discloses an alarm activation processor (112), operably coupled to the status reporter (117), for receiving the status and effecting an alarm response dependent on the status and dependent upon a rule base associated with the first appliance (col. 4, lines 23-29; col. 5, lines 42-53, 64-67; col. 6, lines 1-2; Figs. 1A, 1B and 2). The second alarm processor (113) is further configured to effect the second alarm response dependent upon a second rule base associated with the first appliance. Thus, the rule base is to identify whether the event is an alarm detection condition (e.g. motion or circuit disruption) or a tamper condition

Art Unit: 2632

(e.g. APD removal/intrusion, or cord damage) and to notify security personnel to the location of the alarm and/or tamper condition (col. 5, lines 42-53, 64-67; col. 6, lines 1-2).

4. Claims 24 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bassett et al. (5,706,191) in view of Rietkerk (5,748,083) (of record) as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Le Van Suu (5,714,933) (of record). Bassett et al. in view of Rietkerk as modified teaches all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in the rejection of claim 17, but still does not teach an area security device that is configured to detect a status of an area. Le Van Suu discloses an area security device (13) for detecting an area status of area wherein the activation processor is also operably coupled to the area security device (13) and further effects each alarm response dependent on the area status (col. 4, lines 8-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide an area security device as taught by Le Van Suu in a system as disclosed by Bassett et al. in view of Rietkerk to provide a detector for monitoring the surrounding area of the electronic appliances and for the purpose of providing additional security by monitoring intrusion into the area of the protected appliances.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on August 03, 2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Because,

Art Unit: 2632

Applicant's Argument:

Neither Bassett nor Rietkert teach or suggest distributing security functions among appliances on a network.

Response to Arguments:

Bassett et al. discloses an appliance interface module (AIM) for providing a monitoring and diagnostic functions of the appliances on a distributed network (20) (col. 6, lines 5-14). Thus, it is inherent that the AIM is a status reporter which provides the monitoring and diagnostic to the system controller (15); and connecting alarms and security systems into the overall automation for communicating to effect a control of the appliances (col. 14, lines 53-63). Bassett et al. does not specifically disclose the security system comprising a status reporter for reporting an alarm status. Rietkerk discloses a security system comprising a status reporter (117) for communicating a status of the first appliance (107) via the network (4); an alarm activation processor (112, 113), operably coupled to the status reporter (117), for receiving the status and effecting an alarm response dependent on the status (col. 4, lines 23-29; col. 5, lines 42-53, 64-67; col. 6, lines 1-2; Figs. 1A, 1B and 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilized a status reporter as taught by Rietkerk in a system as disclosed by Bassett et al. for providing the status of the appliance within the network and for providing operation information as well as security information.

Art Unit: 2632

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051 or (703) 305-3988, (for formal communications intended
for entry)

Or:

Art Unit: 2632

(703) 305-3988 (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


8. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Toan Pham at telephone number (703) 306-3038. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:00am-5:00pm.

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffery Hofsass, can be reached on (703) 305-4717.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-8576, Mon-Fri, 8:30am-5:00pm.

Examiner: Toan Pham

Date: October 5, 2001


DANIEL J. WU
Primary Examiner
10/08/01